2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



173 them back to differences of origin. Everyone knows that all Namoos came originally from Mampurugu, how long ago nobody can tell. The tradition of Tongo, as it was related to me on many occasions, is as follows: The ancestor who founded Tongo was Mosuor. He was the Paramount Chief (*na'ab*) of Mampurugu, but had to flee the country after being vanquished in a fight for the chiefship. When he reached Tongo the Gbizug tɛndaana, Gɛnɔt, was living there. Mosuor came to the house but found nobody there; for Tɛndaan Gɛnɔt had seen him coming and had sought refuge in the nearby hills. Now, there is a watercourse a little distance off and there he found a shallow pit beside which stood a *kiŋkaŋ* (*Ficus*) tree which was shedding its leaves. A path led from this water-hole towards the Hills and someone had been carrying water which had spilled over on to this path. 'Thereupon', to quote the version of one of my Tongo informants, 'our ancestor said, "There is someone in these hills who comes to fetch water here". So he caused the dry fig leaves to be scattered on the path and went to hide quietly. In due course he saw Tɛndaan Gɛnɔt stepping along the path, while the leaves crunched *kaya, kaya,* coming to fetch water. Thereupon our ancestor Mosuor, having seen him, caught him and asked him what he was afraid of. Why did he run away and hide? Gɛnɔt replied that he had seen him wearing a gown and that there was something on his head all red, and fear took hold of him.[1] So Mosuor brought him back and asked, "Who owns this house?" He said that it was his house, and Mosuor brought him home thither and said that he himself would settle down here and Gɛnɔt as well. He said that Gɛnɔt would be his tɛndaana to carry out the sacrifices on his behalf.'

Gbizug elders told the story of Mosuor in much the same way but omitting the trick by which Mosuor caught their ancestor, adding that it was the horses and guns of Mosuor that inspired fear in Tɛndaan Gɛnɔt.

173 They say, also, that having accepted Mosuor as a settler and having
●608 allotted land to him close beside his own homestead, he told Mosuor what were the taboos of the country (*tɛŋɔn-kiha*), and entered into a solemn pact of blood-brotherhood with him. They *ŋma pɔlɔŋ*, cut wrists. A cut was made on the wrist of each, and each licked the blood of the other. Thus *'ba leeba mabiih, ba leeba soog*, they became brethren, they became uterine brothers' and pledged themselves and their descendants to perpetual peace. This was a unique instance of blood-brotherhood, which is not practised in Taleland to-day.

773 According to this tradition, Tɛndaan Gɛnɔt told Mosuor of his kinsmen, the Ba'at-Sakpar Tɛndaana, the Wakii Tɛndaana, the Degal tɛndaana, and the Ka'ar tɛndaana. These five were the original inhabitants of the country. They sprang from the Earth itself, say their descendants. At Gbizug they declare that Tɛndaan Gɛnɔt's ancestor Bumbiogta'adug sprouted from the earth (*u bulme na*), he had no father or mother (*u ka ba u ka ma*). Pressed further they say, *'u yi Naawun zug sig na*—he descended from Heaven'. Heaven and Earth are one, they contend; they have the same mystical value. At Wakii they call their first

[292] [1] A red fez and a cloth tunic are the distinctive costume of chiefs of Mampuru origin. Tɛndaanas may not wear garments of cloth. They are ritually obliged to wear skins only. Chiefs and their clansmen may ride horses, tɛndaanas not.

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



*618 tɛndaanaship and in other religious cults. Each segment has its own tɛndaana, the Gbizug tɛndaana being the senior of the two, and in addition the Gbeogdɛm have the cult of the External *Bɔɣar*, like Zubiuŋ and the Hill Talis, whereas the Gbizugdɛm do not participate in this cult. This cleavage comes into operation also in the political and jural relations of the two segments, so that in very many situations Gbeog emerges as an independent settlement.

Both segments have ties of clanship with Soog, the Talis clan sandwiched between Tongo and Wakii. But there is an additional bond between Gbeog and Soog, which is not shared by Gbizug, for one-half of Gbeog is associated with Soog in a common cult of an External *Bɔɣar*, in the same way as the three sections of Zubiuŋ are associated in the cult of their External *Bɔɣar*, Duunkpalɔg. The other half of Gbeog has a separate External *Bɔɣar*. Gbizug has ties of clanship also with Degal, the Tɛnzugu clan, in virtue of the alleged 'brotherhood' of the four primordial tɛndaanas. Yet Wakii and Ka'ar, the clans sprung from the other two primordial tɛndaanas, are merely the *sunzɔp*-by-courtesy of Gbizug, though both, and especially Wakii, have closer spatial, jural, and ritual relations with it than Degal has.

● [608] Soogdɛm have no ties of clanship with Zubiuŋ, but regard them as *sunzɔp*-by-courtesy. They are linked by a ritual relationship which comes into effect whenever a Zubiuŋ tɛndaana dies. There was for a long time an estrangement between the two clans, because some years ago a Zubiuŋ youth married the ex-wife of a Soog man. A ceremonial reconciliation [627] under somewhat dramatic circumstances took place recently when ritual necessity compelled the elders of the offender's lineage to send a deputation to beg the pardon of the Soog elders. Apart from this intermittent and very limited ritual collaboration, the clanship-by-courtesy of Soog and Zubiuŋ is very weak. One of the standing jokes in Zubiuŋ concerned two [735] of the lineage heads of Soog. These two old men are notoriously poor through bodily infirmity, and therefore make use of every opportunity of getting free food or drink. Thus, whenever there is a funeral at Zubiuŋ they appear as representatives of their clan to claim their share of beer and meat as *sunzɔp*-by-courtesy; but Zubiuŋdɛm have long ceased to go to Soog funerals.

From Ba'ari the mesh of clan linkages continues across the dialectal boundary with the Gorisi. Ba'at-Sakpar has clanship ties with Samaab biis, a section of Bolɔga. 'They are our kinsmen', said the Ba'at-Sakpar tɛndaana-elect, 'even though they have become Gorisi.' Another Bolɔga section are similarly related to Ba'at-Lakum yiri. Ba'at-Guŋ, on the other hand, have ties of clanship with Tamboog on Tɛnzugu, and Ba'at-Dun biis have ties of clanship with Samiit on Tɛnzugu. Yayanuor and Gbee are *sunzɔp*-by-courtesy to all sections of Ba'ari.

The internal constitution of Ba'ari is interesting, in that the whole clan is grouped around Ba'at-Sakpar. Thus, Ba'at-Lakum yiri has the status of an attached lineage of Sakpar. Their founding ancestor was said to have been a sororal nephew of Sakpar, begotten by a Zubiuŋ man—hence also their ties with Zubiuŋ; and Ba'at-Guŋ is similarly an attached lineage of Lakum yiri. Being related to Sakpar by a remove, Guŋ is allowed to

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



Kpoləg (Pwoləg), Sipaat has no ties of clanship with either of these places. Yinduuri, a clan whose inner constitution is a miniature replica of the whole system of interlacing clanship ties which we have been describing, is contiguous with Zandoya but has no ties of clanship with it. Zandoya's clanship ties link it with Gorogo, which in turn is linked with a group of Gərisi, who live in the Bolaga district.

This is but one series of concatenated clan linkages running from end to end of the Tongo district and even, like those of the Namoos, extending across to the Gərisi. Similar chains of clanship ties link the other Talis clans to one another and to this series; and the whole forms an elaborately reticulated system which stretches beyond the linguistic and cultural frontiers of Taleland. By these chains of clanship ties the Talis are linked on to peoples outside Taleland who live quite beyond the boundaries of their regular interests and concerns.

We have been discussing clanship in the narrow sense—that is, ties implying the prohibition of marriage, joint leviratic rites, the reciprocal privileges and duties of *sunzɔp*, and such things as the liability in former times to be raided for one another's debts. As a rule, every constituent maximal lineage of every clan has such ties with one or more territorially contiguous lineages of neighbouring clans. Most of them also have clanship ties with some lineages of clans not adjacent to them, but not very far away, reckoning the distance in terms of the number of unrelated clans intervening and not by geographical criteria. There is no fixed rule; but within this cluster of settlements it is always a safe prediction that the greater the distance separating two clans the less likely are they to be linked by clanship.

In addition, every clan recognizes one or more clans in its vicinity as *sunzɔp*-by-courtesy. Soog and Wakii; Gundaat, Kpatã'ar, and Bunkiuk; Yinduur and Zandoya; Sii and Gorogo: these consider one another to be *sunzɔp*-by-courtesy, and they generally appear at one another's funerals in this capacity.

As with Zubiuŋ and the clans adjacent to it, so among the Hill Talis, the ties which make up the field of clanship of any maximal lineage are not all of equal strength. The critical norms have an absolute value. Clanship prohibits intermarriage, vests defined rights and obligations in each lineage, and implies a solidarity which is incompatible with hostile acts like war or abducting one another's wives, or raiding one another's cattle. If these norms are infringed, as inevitably happens now and then, they are not thereby invalidated. The infringement tends to provoke processes which cancel out its effects and either re-establish the invulnerability of the norms or bring about a new alinement of structural ties, which neutralizes the breach. At the same time spatial distribution has a selective influence on the extent and frequency of the intercourse between lineages linked by ties of clanship. Proximity encourages more frequent and regular co-operation in situations which mobilize ties of clanship. Other factors, too, influence the gradation of clanship ties, the most important of these being the fact that solidarity, co-operation, and mutual dependence are greater within the clan than between linked lineages of different clans. Besides having a specific field of clanship, each maximal

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



in pursuit. The youth zigzagged through the crowd, flourishing his leg of mutton, and threw it to a companion as the old man reached and grappled with him. For a few minutes they wrestled on the refuse heap, the old man pretending fury with the most realistic mimicry, as he cried out, 'you thief, you scoundrel', and his opponent making a pretence of resisting vigorously. A horde of small boys pranced around them with joy, and the elders at the gateway shook with laughter. Then it was all over, and everybody's attention reverted to the serious business of dividing the meat. 'Those young fellows are Sakpeedɛm', an elder explained to me; 'we and Sakpee abuse each other, it is brother-in-lawship, and not fighting.' This incident was a striking instance of how a social definition steers a situation. Anyone but a Sakpee man acting thus would have been set upon and manhandled; even a Zubiuŋ man, if he were to commit such an unthinkable act, would have been severely mauled.

When the natives speak of this as brother-in-lawship, they make it clear that they are speaking figuratively. A clan's joking partners are usually clans that live just beyond the range of its effective ties of clanship. They are clans who actually are or might be the *sunzɔp* of its *sunzɔp* by clanship or by courtesy. Thus they lie on the border between two zones. On the one side lies the zone in which the clan has precisely defined social ties implying specific rights and obligations and resting on the assumption of amity and solidarity. Serious conflict with these clans is regarded as incompatible with the basic axioms of social relations, and when it occurs it always precipitates action designed to re-establish normal social relations. On the other side live people with whom no direct structural ties exist; they may be friendly if they wish, but they can be hostile with impunity. They are clans whose wives can be abducted or seduced, if one is bold enough, without infringing the loyalty of clanship or necessarily incurring instant reprisals.

Joking partners lie between these two sets of clans, and are likely to be connected with both by structural ties of one kind or another. Thus the joking partners of my clan are not our *sunzɔp* nor our possible but inaccessible enemies. They are the *sunzɔp* of our *sunzɔp*, in relation to whom both my clan and theirs have similar rights, obligations, and sentiments. This is a bond of friendliness between us. But they are also the *sunzɔp* of our possible enemies, who may side with them against us, and this is a source of latent opposition between us. The conventions of the joking relationship symbolize piquantly the interstitial status of joking partners between friends, who have rights, duties, and loyalties to one another, and potential enemies. Their privileged aggression reconciles the conflicting definitions of *sunzɔp*, whose right to a share of the meat symbolizes reciprocal bonds, and non-*sunzɔp* who have no right to it because of the absence of reciprocal obligations; of people who are near (*pɔrɔga*)—a significant concept in Tale political thought indicating both spatial and social proximity—and those who are far (*zaa ha*); of people whose friendliness can be relied upon, and those who are incalculable.

This is obvious both in the custom of mock abuse and in the snatching of meat or other food at a funeral ceremony. The joking partners obtain a share of the meat almost as if they were *sunzɔp*—but by a burlesque of

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



seizing it by violence, almost as if they were hostile intruders. *Sunzɔp* have *a priori* no need of force to assert their privileges; if they did resort to it the affront would be so grave as to rupture the ties of clanship with them. Unrelated strangers could only get one of the shares due to *sunzɔp* if they had the temerity to seize it—but they would be fortunate if they escaped with their lives, even in these days of curbed passions. The mock aggression of a joking partner is a caricature blending these contradictory ways of behaviour.

Joking partners are not obliged to tease one another. They do so spontaneously when the situation seems appropriate. People who are greatly unequal in years or status, or personally related by cognatic kinship, will not act in this way. The joking partnership merely fixes the group with whose members such behaviour is appropriate in appropriate circumstances; a casual encounter, for instance, where anybody but a joking partner or a close kinsman would be met with the customary greeting—'*ni i tooma*', lit. 'with your work'. It is also appropriate, as we have seen, in situations such as funeral ceremonies, where there is a very strict determination of attendance and behaviour by clearly defined social ties. But even there joking partners turn up largely by chance. They happen to be passing, or a few young men, hearing of the funeral and knowing that there will be dancing and girls, go for the lark of it. For distant *sunzɔp*, too, attendance at funeral ceremonies is very often a matter of chance, but it is also very often the result of a decision by responsible elders.

Such institutionalized joking partnerships do not appear to exist among the Namoos. This may be correlated with the less elaborate interlocking of constituted ties and cleavages among them than among the Talis. An analogous practice which throws light on the ideas implicit in standardized joking partnership was, however, in vogue among the several branches of Mosuor biis until recently. When there was a funeral at Yaməlɔg a party of relatives-in-law (*deenam*) would sometimes pass through Tongo from Wakii or Tɛnzugu carrying the obligatory food contributions consisting of a basket of porridge and a whole sheep or goat cut up and cooked. Tongo youths would then, if they had a chance, intercept them and compel them to give up most of the food, leaving only a small portion to prove to the Yaməlɔg people that their relatives-in-law had discharged their obligations. The Yaməlɔg people would naturally be indignant; they would denounce the Tongo youths as thieves and rascals, and upbraid their relatives-in-law for yielding so timorously. Then they would wait for an opportunity to recoup themselves in kind. Next time a similar party of relatives-in-law bound for Tongo from Nabərug passed through Yaməlɔg they would be waylaid and robbed in the same way. It was thought of as a practical joke, and accepted as such by the victims. The annoyance it caused soon blew over and did not leave a lasting grudge, for it was understood to be an exaggerated enforcement of the rights of *sunzɔp* to a prescribed share of such contributions if they happened to turn up at the funeral.

In the same way, twenty years ago, a Tongo man who chanced to be passing through Yaməlɔg when the guinea corn was ripening or the

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



ground-nuts ready for harvesting might pluck a few twigs of guinea corn or pull up a bunch of ground-nuts to stay his hunger. He would shout out, 'Whose corn is this, yo-o-o? I am going to pluck some.' The owner, standing on his flat roof, would probably remonstrate and swear, but he would not raise a hue and cry, for this was not theft but an exaggerated assertion of clanship ties. Nowadays, since the political jealousies between the chiefs of Tongo and of Yamələg have brought about a state of chronic hostility between the two places, this pleasant custom has fallen into disuse. It is impossible to tease people with whom one has open or suppressed enmity; it would certainly provoke a fight.

Such liberties, it is of interest to note, could never be taken with the people of Sie or Biuk, though they, too, are the clan *sunzɔp* of Tongo. For, as my informants explained, 'they are too far away, and therefore they would resent it'. On the other hand, while any Tongo man can pluck a handful of guinea corn or a bunch of ground-nuts from a clansman's field at Tongo if the two men are on good terms, no one would dare to intercept the food contribution of another Tongo section's relatives-in-law. A serious quarrel would inevitably result. 'We are too near each other, we are like the members of a single family', explained my informants. Every segment of Tongo is likely to be represented at the funeral ceremony at which these contributions from relatives-in-law are shared, to claim the share due to it. For any segment to anticipate this by violence would be a gratuitous insult implying that the other segments do not respect its rights. The people of Yamələg and of Sie used to act in the same way towards each other before the political jealousies that to-day poison their relationship arose.

All Tallensi think alike on matters of this sort, which fall within the ambit of their common culture, whatever their particular structural affiliations may be. This Namoo custom and its recent obsolescence fit the pattern we have established for the more conventionalized joking partnerships of the Talis.

Yet another kind of joking which I have several times witnessed adds confirmation to our analysis, the more so because it is entirely informal. This occurs between the members of two maximal lineages which are bound to one another by inescapable ties of politico-ritual interdependence. They are usually maximal lineages which have complementary politico-ritual offices, such as a chiefship and the tɛndaanaship complementary to it. A large element of tension is necessarily involved in these relationships. Mutual loyalty and solidarity in situations involving common interests are counterbalanced by mutual suspicion in matters concerning the private interests and possessions of each lineage. Behind a strong sense of amity and interdependence lurks a jealous vigilance in regard to reciprocal rights and duties.

When, therefore, representatives of the two groups meet in a ceremonial or jural situation, the more aggressive among the elders often taunt one another playfully at moments when ceremonial formality is relaxed. Gbizug and Tongo men, for example, have a habit of doing this. The Chief of Tongo and the Gbizug tɛndaana, on the rare occasions when they meet in public, will interrupt a long and ceremonious discussion with a

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



*bɔyar*, again, is both literally and socially the domestic replica of the External *Bɔyar*. It is kept at the homestead of the lineage head, and it symbolizes the particular ancestors of that lineage only. Only that particular lineage offers sacrifices through its head to its *dugni bɔyar*, that is, to its own ancestors; all three lineages meet at Duunkpaləg in ritual homage to all their ancestors. (The *dugni bɔyar* of a Zubiuŋ lineage, as among all the Talis, consists of two small pots embedded in a projecting bulge of the outside wall of the house, together with other sacred paraphernalia, and, as usual, smeared all over with the dried flour, blood, and feathers of many sacrifices.)

The two aspects of the *Bɔyar* cult mark the two poles of clan structure—on the one hand, the relative autonomy of the constituent lineages of the clan; on the other, the unity and the solidarity of the clan, synthesizing these relative autonomies in a wider field of social organization, but according to the same principles of structure that operate to constitute these relatively autonomous units. Though less explicitly, the same pattern of ritual collaboration obtains at Zubiuŋ with respect to the cult of the Earth.

The lineages of other clans with which Zubiuŋ has ties of clanship never participate in sacrifices at Duunkpaləg or at any of the Zubiuŋ Earth shrines. A linked lineage has ritual ties only with the Zubiuŋ maximal lineage to which it is directly linked, but these ties are very elastic. Thus, in situations in which the corporate identity of one of the constituent maximal lineages of Zubiuŋ is emphasized—for example, in the ceremonies of inducting a new tɛndaana into his office, or in the funeral rites of a deceased tɛndaana—members of the linked lineages of that group are nominally obliged to participate in the exoteric phases of the ceremonies. This obligation, however, is not so rigorous as in the case of the other Zubiuŋ lineages.

B. *Ba'ari*. The pattern of ritual collaboration between the component units of Ba'ari is slightly different. There the focal shrine of the clan is the principal sacred grove (*tɔŋgbaŋ*) consecrated to the Earth, Ba'at Da'a. Important sacrifices there, particularly during the Great Festivals, require the presence of all the constituent lineages of Ba'ari, including the accessory lineages. This is not regarded as inconsistent with the fact that one of the attached lineages, Ba'at-Guŋ, is permitted to intermarry with two of the other lineages, though otherwise exercising the rights and obligations of close *sunzɔ*. Ba'ari lacks the cult of the External *Bɔyar*, and the lineage (*dugni*) *bɔyar* of each of its constituent lineages is associated with Ba'at Da'a, which doubles the functions of an External *Bɔyar* and a focal *tɔŋgbaŋ*. Ba'at Da'a has, in fact, two ritual aspects. In its esoteric aspect it is the ideological pivot around which the clan revolves. Only the clan takes part in the cult associated with this aspect; linked lineages of other clans have no share in it. It also has an exoteric aspect connected with certain phases of the cycle of the Great Festivals. Again, linked lineages take no part in the ritual that defines this aspect. But the people of Gbiuŋ have a formal role in these rites, and so have Wakii and Yaŋazuor, who are *sunzɔ*-by-courtesy. These clans participate, not in virtue of ties of clanship with Ba'ari, but by reason of their ritual bonds. They have a

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



general ritual bond in the tendaanaship and the special ritual relationship with the Earth which this office imposes on a group that has the prerogative of it, and they have a specific ritual bond that comes into action during the Great Festivals.

At the level of these ritual relations, Ba'ari, Gbizug, Wakii, and Yayazuor are brethren (*mabiis*) to one another. Gbizug, it will be remembered, is also linked to Ba'ari by clanship ties; through it, therefore, the scheme of linkage by clanship ties is interlocked with the scheme of linkage through ritual ties; and the myth in which the social relations of Gbizug and Ba'at-Sakpar are symbolically pictured expresses this double-sided interdependence. As will be clearer presently, the organization of ritual ties between corporate units, like that of clanship ties, follows the field principle. Working at different levels of the social structure in the service of different interests, the two systems are interlocked but not congruent. They reinforce each other by counterbalancing each other; and both kinds of ties are translated into the basic idiom of Tale social relations, the idiom of genealogical connexion.

C. *Gbizug.* We shall see this more clearly if we consider the role of Gbizug in this configuration. As we have noted before, linked maximal lineages have the right to participate in exoteric ceremonies (such as funeral ceremonies) in which the corporate identity of the particular Ba'ari lineage with which they have clanship ties emerges; but clanship ties do not give them the right to take part in the religious cults in which the corporate unity and identity of the whole clan emerges. They have no bonds with the clan as a whole, but only with the relatively autonomous segments of the clan. Gbizug, however, is bound to a segment of the clan by clanship ties and to the whole clan by ritual ties, and the bridge between these two sets of ties is Ba'at-Sakpar. Gbizug has no loyalties to the rest of Ba'ari, other than Ba'at-Sakpar, on the level of clanship; in this respect Gbizug is a threat to the stability of Ba'at-Sakpar's field of clanship. The latter's loyalties to Gbizug might in certain circumstances clash with its loyalties to the rest of Ba'ari. Compromise and adjustment are made possible by the scheme of ritual ties. The partly independent fields of clanship of Gbizug and Ba'at-Sakpar are adjusted to one another at a different level of social organization. In the frame of ritual relations, Gbizug is, as it were, assimilated to the whole clan of Ba'ari, drawn into the field of clanship of Ba'at-Sakpar.

It follows that on this plane of ritual relations Gbeog and Zubiuŋ-Yakɔra are indirectly bound to the whole of Ba'ari, for Gbizug represents its whole field of clanship in its corporate ritual relationship with Ba'ari. At a further remove Zubiuŋ Yakɔra is the bridge between the whole of Zubiuŋ and the whole of Ba'ari through Gbizug; and this rule extends, by a series of removes, to all the Talis.

### *The Underlying Principles of Ritual Collaboration*

We must try to see clearly the principles underlying this bewildering hierarchy of social ties between corporate units in Taleland. It is as difficult to state this principle simply and precisely as it was for the writer to elicit it from the confusing and, at first sight, inconsistent welter of

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



of any of the Hill Talis clans. Each of the two maximal lineages that constitute Kpata'ar, Kpata'arna'ab yiri and Nakyeet yiri, has its own private lineage *bɔyar*. Though bound by all the reciprocal duties and privileges that make them the closest clan *sunzɔp* of each other, the genealogical cleavage between them is somewhat more strongly emphasized than it is between the constituent maximal lineages of Zubiuŋ, for example. The head of Kpata'arna'ab yiri is the head of the clan, and *eo ipso* the senior ritual functionary and principal custodian of the Bona'ab *Bɔyar*. The head of Nakyeet yiri has a complementary role in relation to him in political, ritual, and jural affairs that concern the whole clan.

The politico-ritual office held by the head of Kpata'arna'ab yiri is symbolized in a shrine that is ancillary to the External *Bɔyar*. It is in the sole custody of Kpata'arna'ab yiri. But when sacrifice is offered at it on prescribed occasions Nakyeet yiri must also be represented; and in addition Dakuor yiri, the component maximal lineage of Bunkiuk with which Kpata'arna'ab yiri has ties of clanship, must be represented and share in the sacrament. Thus, both Nakyeet yiri and Dakuor yiri, though they themselves have no ties of clanship, take part in a common sacrifice with Kpata'arna'ab yiri because of their clanship ties with the latter. In this case the central region of the field of clanship of Kpata'arna'ab yiri becomes actualized in a sacrament that symbolizes the exclusive rights to a particular politico-ritual office held by that maximal lineage.

But what about the worship of the External *Bɔyar*, Bona'ab? As its senior custodians, the men of Kpata'arna'ab yiri can sacrifice there alone or accompanied by Nakyeet yiri, if they desire the intercession of the *Bɔyar* in matters that concern them only. When the Great Festivals come round, however, it is obligatory for the whole congregation of the *Bɔyar* to join together in the performance of the ceremonies. The other communicants, beside the two segments of Kpata'ar, are Gundaat, Samiit and two of its linked lineages, together counting as a single unit, and Sakpee II.

The cult of the *Bɔyar* Bona'ab is the central force uniting this group of maximal lineages. It is, we must emphasize, not a permanent bond of union that operates at all times and under all conditions, but a synthesis that emerges chiefly in the context of the Great Festivals. During the festivals their interdependence in the cult of the *Bɔyar* imposes mutual amity and solidarity on this group of maximal lineages. At other times this is not always an effective sanction of amity and goodwill. For these ties of ritual collaboration are not homogeneous. Underneath them run other ties which reinforce them in the context of the *Bɔyar* cult but might act against them outside of this context. There are first the ties of clanship linking Kpata'arna'ab yiri with Nakyeet yiri, Nakyeet yiri with Sakpee, Sakpee with Gundaat, in a chain, as it were. Then there are the ties of clanship-by-courtesy which link all these lineages with one another. Samiit and Sakpee have bonds of local contiguity because they 'sit together on the same land' under the ritual jurisdiction of the Sakpee tendaana. Gundaat and Samiit are *sunzɔp*-by-courtesy, bound by a covenant of mutual amity which they trace back to the alleged kinship ties of their mythological founding ancestors. Gundaat and Kpata'ar

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



leopard taboo of Dkoog; for these taboos are of the same class as those of the Talis.

An individual's avoidance of his matrilateral spirit-guardian's totems is, of course, an avoidance of the totems of the latter's lineage. They are the people who have the custody of the shrine at which sacrifices must be offered to the *sɛyər* spirit; their mediation is essential for a correct relationship between ward and spirit-guardian. It is with them, the living members of the spirit-guardian's lineage, that the ward shares the communion of sacrifice, and this is the fundamental condition for preserving the mystical goodwill of the *sɛyər*. On the same principle, a person given as ward to a Talis *Bɔyar* would be precluded from sacrificing to the *sɛyər*, that is from sharing in the communion of sacrifice with the members of the *Bɔyar* congregation through whom alone ritual access can be gained to the *Bɔyar*, if he does not observe their totemic avoidances. This is the symbol of the unique religious and moral bond between them. There are other ways, too, in which a matrilateral ancestor can be endowed with direct and permanent ritual efficacy for a man. Such a spirit may become (*naam*) his divining spirit (*bakologo*) or his Destiny (*yin*). Then he will have to call upon this ancestor's agnatic descendants to come and consecrate a shrine to the spirit at his house. He will have to sacrifice to this spirit and share the communion of sacrifice with the spirit's agnatic descendants. Therefore, he, too, must respect the totems of this matrilateral ancestor's lineage.

We see, therefore, that an individual can have private totemic observances not shared by other members of his lineage or clan. Like clan totems, however, they become obligatory on him in virtue of a particular tie of descent. Superficially, they can be understood as emblems of this tie and of the living kinship ties that flow from it. But there is more to it than this, as we see from the totemic bond between stranger wards of an External *Bɔyar* and the *Bɔyar* congregation.

The stranger ward and his parents are not kinsmen of the lineage that sponsors them. But they do acquire a relationship of what might be called quasi-kinship with their sponsors and a ritual bond with the *Bɔyar* which carries social duties and religious obligations equivalent to those of adherents by descent of the *Bɔyar*. These relationships are based on the fact that stranger pilgrims establish a line of descent through the mystical aid of the *Bɔyar*. It is, as the natives put it, 'because it is on his (the *Bɔyar's*) account that we have begotten children'.

Similarly, the association of totemic and other ritual observances with lineage and clanship groupings is seen to have a wider significance when the client lineages of Hill Talis *Bɔya* are brought into the picture. The ties between client lineages and the true member lineages of the *Bɔyar* to which they owe ritual allegiance may be called quasi-clanship, to sum up the native interpretation of the relationship in one word.

### *Totemic Taboos and the Patrilineal Principle*

We have endeavoured to keep the information adduced in the preceding pages down to the minimum necessary for our argument. It is enough, however, to justify the conclusion that the ritual observances we have

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



living at Zoo and Gbambee, though they are an integral part of the community.

Like all Tale settlements Tongo has no fixed territorial boundaries. (See map at end of book.) Its frontiers with the circumjacent settlements take the form of a social circumference, kept in being by local, genealogical, and politico-ritual ties and cleavages. This is the line of ecological and social balance between Tongo and its neighbours, more or less stable now, but still undergoing minor readjustments as this balance changes with alterations in the internal equilibrium of any of these units. It is most stable and firm where the genealogical, political, and ideological cleavages between Tongo and its neighbours are clear-cut and dominant; it is more pervious where Tongo's structural ties with an adjacent clan have greater strength than the cleavages between them. Thus, there is a distinct though sometimes narrow territorial separation between the outermost homesteads of Tongo and those of Wakii, Soog, Gbeog, and Ba'ari. At one point on the west side of Tongo only a stretch of cultivation separates Tongo homesteads from Wakii homesteads a stone's throw away. Tongo homesteads actually lie on the Wakii side of the watercourse which might have formed a natural boundary between them. On the south this watercourse and a straggling outcrop of rocks and boulders hedge in Tongo and mark it off from Wakii. A prominent landmark here is Samoo, a mass of huge rocks overgrown with trees and scrub. It is a sacred spot, the External *Bɔyar* of Soog and Gbeog. North of Samoo lies Tongo, the nearest Tongo homestead being about 50 yards away; south of it are Wakii and Soog. It would be most unlikely for a Tongo man to build his homestead on the south side of Samoo, or for a Soog or Wakii man to live north of it. For Samoo symbolizes all that the Namoos consider alien, hostile, and to some extent repugnant, in the cultural differences and structural cleavages between themselves and the Hill Talis. In olden days the immediate vicinity of Samoo was the no-man's-land where the two groups used to meet in battle.

Soog, Wakii, Gbeog, and Ba'ari, all Talis clans that were among the traditional enemies of Tongo in war, are all demarcated from the latter. On the border between Tongo and each of these clans is a stretch of land, cultivated or uncultivated, but free of homesteads, which is still thought of as the traditional battle-ground of the two groups. It is significant that these battle-grounds are all associated with Earth or *Bɔyar* shrines under the ritual jurisdiction of the Talis clans.

By contrast it is impossible to draw a clear line between the homesteads of Tongo and those of Zubiuŋ or Zoo. They merge completely. This corresponds to the close ties which have always existed between these three units and have enabled them to fuse easily into a single political community under the authority of the Chief of Tongo, since his acquisition of judicial and executive power under British rule.

In the old days Zubiuŋ and Zoo always fought on the side of Tongo against the Hill Talis. Both clans have direct politico-ritual roles in connexion with the Tongo chiefship, and come into its immediate field of influence, whereas the Hill Talis and Ba'ari come into its secondary field of influence. The three clans act as *sunɔɔp*-by-courtesy (cf. ch. V) to

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11



618 one another in funerals and similar ceremonial events. These ceremonial
[608] reciprocities do not prevail between Tongo or Zoo and any of the Hill Talis clans adjacent to them.

621 184 Nevertheless, a palpable social boundary still prevails between Tongo and Zubiuŋ, but one far less determinate than that between Tongo and its other Talis neighbours. No Zubiuŋ homesteads are so situated as to be surrounded on all sides by Tongo homesteads, and vice versa; there is no indiscriminate mingling of the homesteads of the two clans. Looked at from within, both Zubiuŋ and Tongo are self-contained spatial units within their respective social circumferences. This is correlated with their contrasting totemic observances, clan cults, and politico-ritual offices; their mutual exclusiveness by the canon of agnatic descent and the liberty to intermarry that goes with this; and their consequent divergent jural interests as distinct corporate units; the people of Tongo are Namoos, the Zubiuŋdem Talis. The observer is constantly apprised of this in the attitudes and opinions of individuals, in economic activities, and in jural and ritual events, the very activities and events which reveal the close bonds of the two groups. Tongo people never scrupled to raid their weaker Zubiuŋ neighbours for cattle owed to them, as many old men relate from personal experience. On the other hand, responsible elders and chiefs of Tongo, in those days, disapproved strongly of resort to violent self-help against Zubiuŋ by their people, though they could not always prevent it—an attitude they would never adopt in regard to the other Talis. To-day Tongo and Zubiuŋ people regard one another with a certain amount of suspicion and good-natured superiority, tempered with a tolerance which the former never show towards the other Talis.

621 184 166 A similar, but more elastic, social boundary exists between Tongo and Zoo. There are no Zoo people living inside Tongo, but no less than 11 of the 39 homesteads situated on the land under the ritual jurisdiction of Zoo-Yiraaŋ, within the social circumference of Zoo, are the homes of permanent immigrants from Tongo. The bond of common stock (*buurət*) between these two locally allied and politically associated Namoo clans blurs the cleavages between them. Tongo people find it the more congenial to live amongst Zoo people in considerable numbers because they have the same ritual observances, mortuary and funeral customs, and politico-ritual offices and values. It is mainly cultural differences of this kind that deter them from settling amongst the people of Zubiuŋ.

The one-sided filtration of Tongo people into Zoo, and the absence of the reverse process, are due mainly to the density of habitation—which is so great as to preclude immigration—and the obvious excess of population at Tongo. Zoo people who wish to emigrate, temporarily or permanently, move farther afield, to Gbambee or Biuŋ. In any case, the flow of migration from Tongo to Zoo has apparently reached saturation, for it has now practically stopped. But this movement, though at bottom an ecological readjustment, has been canalized by the social structure; and while it brings out the affinities of Tongo with Zoo, it also emphasizes their separateness. Because they are structurally independent of each other, Tongo people only migrate to Zoo if they have matrilateral kin there who will grant them land to build on and farm. By contrast,

3: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1949
FE11 Tallensi FE11



593 In the broadest sense, then, *mabiis* are cognates who are on terms of equality with one another and have a mutual interest in one another's welfare. In the narrowest and prototypical sense *mabiis* are siblings by the same parents. The emphasis is on their equality of status due to a common relationship with their parents.

*The Equivalence of Siblings*

The key to the social relations of siblings in Tale society and to the effects on the whole social structure of the sibling bond is the principle to which Radcliffe-Brown has given the name of 'the social equivalence of siblings'.[1] It is as true of the Tallensi as of the Australian aborigines that 'there is a very strong, intimate and permanent social bond between two brothers born and brought up in the same family', and that they 'occupy similar positions in the total social structure'. As we shall see, the latter proposition has to be translated into terms of the lineage organization to give it the appropriate connotation for the Tallensi. Siblings derive their social equivalence—that is, equivalence in jural, ritual, and economic relations, as opposed, for example, to private marital relations —from their common relationship with their parents. Outside the lineage range of strictly reckoned classificatory kinship, the recognition of siblingship implies not so much similar positions in the social structure as similar roles in certain situations due to membership of the same corporate groups, or, with matrilateral kin, to having common ascendants. We have, in fact, already had a good deal of evidence in preceding chapters of the social equivalence of siblings. We have seen also how the recognition of siblingship varies in significance according to the lineage context. What we wish to do now is to study the sibling relationship in its own right. By bringing the evidence together in a unitary picture we shall be able to see what constitutes the social equivalence of siblings. We shall find it useful for purposes of our analysis to distinguish between the solidarity of siblings and their equivalence.

593 ●608 But before we examine the social equivalence of siblings more fully it is worth noting that there is, among the Tallensi, a correlated principle of social action of very wide application. Individuals who have the same social role or have had similar socially critical experiences are identified with one another whenever their role or these experiences come into a situation. The best instance is the case of co-wives who always speak of each other as sisters. All chiefs are regarded as 'brothers' (*mabiis*) because of their chiefship; so also are tendaanas. We have seen how men who have no father or mother alive are identified with one another at funeral ceremonies by the fact that only those who have undergone this social experience may take part in certain rites. Similarly only those who have themselves lost a wife or a husband may look after

[1] A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, 'The Social Organization of Australian Tribes', Part 3, *Oceania*, I, 1930–1, pp. 428–9.

3: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1949
FE11 Tallensi FE11



the widow (or widower) during a funeral, or assist in the rites of purifying the widow or share her meals. Tallensi assert that a breach of this rule is impossible as no man or woman who had not had the experience would take charge of a widow. It is a taboo (*kihər*), and anyone who infringed it would die. Again, owners of diviners' shrines (*bakologo* shrines—the diviner is called *baya*) are identified in certain situations, though they do not form a corporate body of any sort. Thus when a new diviner's shrine is being set up for a man certain portions of the beer used in the rites can be drunk only by men who already have such shrines, and it is they who carry out the final rites by which the actual power of divination is conferred on him. Similarly it is only men who have themselves undergone the experience and the treatment who may assist in the ritual of purifying a homicide or a man who has slain a big game animal such as a bush cow. The list of illustrations could be extended, but this will suffice to show how deeply rooted the idea is. It is, however, only a determinant of individual conduct and sentiment, giving rise to *ad hoc* co-operation in certain situations, and not a principle of association in corporate units.

### *Factors modifying the Sibling Bond*

The solidarity and social equivalence of siblings are conditioned by a number of factors. Differences of sex and, between like-sex siblings, of age are important. But distinctions of equal or even greater significance are imposed on siblings by the fundamental principles of the social structure. Siblingship does not cancel out the uniqueness of the individual, as symbolized in the notion of the *Yin*, and socially crystallized in the precise differentiation of the lineage segment which he or she founds. This factor, with its counterpart in the family structure and the economic organization of the household, is not important in childhood, but increases steadily in influence with the years. It is the basis of the fission between fraternal descent lines and, consequently, of the ramification of a lineage sprung from one progenitrix. How it works out, however, in a particular case depends upon the position of each person in terms of patrilineal descent and maternal origin. Thus the sibling relationship, while itself an important constitutive factor of the lineage structure, is reciprocally moulded by that structure. The relationship of brothers among the Tallensi might very well have been different from what it is if their social organization provided for the continuous merging of collateral lines of descent in lineal lines,[1] so that lineage branches springing from brothers were not specifically recognized, but only the inclusive trunk-line deriving from a distant ancestor.

[1] This appears to be the case with the Nuer at higher levels of lineage structure (cf. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *The Nuer*, Oxford, 1940, ch. v) and among some Southern Bantu tribes, such as the Zulu (cf. E. J. Krige, *The Social System of the Zulu*, 1936).